The
COMMONWEAL

VOLUME XLI *February 23, 1945* NUMBER 19

THE WEEK 459
PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING
An Army Private 462
J. M. O'Neill 464
DUMBARTON OAKS *Luigi Sturzo* 467
COMMUNICATIONS 473
THE STAGE *Kappo Phelan* 474
THE SCREEN *Philip T. Hartung* 475
BOOKS OF THE WEEK 476
A Preface to Newman's Theology—The Shape of Books to Come—Great Son

THE COMMONWEAL *is indexed in the Reader's Guide, Catholic Periodical Index and Catholic Bookman.*

Published weekly and copyrighted 1945 in the U.S.A. by THE COMMONWEAL Publishing Co., Inc., 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. ASHland 4-9685. Entered as second class matter February 9, 1934 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. U.S. $5 a year. Canada and Foreign $6. Single copies 10c.

Editors: EDWARD SKILLIN, JR.
PHILIP BURNHAM (*now on duty with the armed forces*)

MARY LOREN BINESS, *Managing Editor*; MICHAEL WILLIAMS, *Special Editor*; C. G. PAULDING, *Literary Editor*; JOHN C. CORT, *Associate Editor*; JOHN BRUBAKER, *Advertising Manager*.

Yalta

THE BIG NEWS this week, of course, is the announcement of the agreement reached by Messrs. Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin at Yalta, where the Czars built themselves a resort-palace, and where the airs are salubrious and mild. Some of the mildness of the Crimea may perhaps have melted the hearts of the Big Three, so that they reached a unanimity in agreement exceeding what had been forecast, but there is nothing mild in their pronouncement regarding Germany. That is unquestionably the center on which they came to their agreement. England and Russia have the best of all possible reasons for never wanting to see an expansive Germany resurrected. Both nations have suffered in a way difficult for Americans really to appreciate. Both have lost sons, husbands, wives and children in direct casualties, both have seen destroyed things dear to them through generations of association. For all this they hold German expansiveness responsible. Therefore what they propose to do is to satisfy themselves that an expansive Germany will not again destroy their citizens or their material achievements. In this, of course, the United States is agreed, and we are now committed—as far as the President can commit us—to a share in the policing of Germany after the war. This decision is one of the things our more isolationist leaders will in time object to.

The decision which will arouse the greatest amount of controversy is the decision to accede to Russia's demands regarding Poland's frontiers. Having refused two and a half years ago to discuss territorial changes until the war is over, we had created a situation in which we had little bargaining power—or at least not enough to change Stalin's determination on the question of the Curzon Line frontier. So now the President reverses an earlier policy, accedes to a territorial settlement before the end of the war, and we believe he has acted wisely in doing so. For at least the Yalta agreement tends to stabilize the situation in Poland and opens up the possibility of a reasonably independent Polish State. That represents a real gain. The decision to broaden the Lublin Government by adding to it new elements undoubtedly was a compromise on Stalin's part. It is encouraging to realize that Stalin is willing to compromise at all. Of course we do possess considerable bargaining power in terms of economic help to Russia after the war. Such help is not even mentioned in the Yalta statement, but it must have played a part in persuading Stalin to yield with regard to the Lublin Government. Since Russia is not without some justifiable claim to the territory east of the Curzon Line, the settlement of the Polish question, though departing from absolute justice, is probably as good a settlement as we could expect.

The Yalta statement likewise seems to indicate that from now on France and China will be given a greater share in negotiations between the principal Allies. It is devoutly to be hoped that they will be. But we are still dubious about the notion of a Big Three hegemony. The mechanisms set up for future joint action by the Big Three seem promising, if only because the Big Three system is entirely dependent for its smooth functioning upon real joint action. The greatest danger inherent in such a set-up is the possible emergence of irreconcilable differences between the major partners.

The Murray Bill

SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY of Montana has introduced a bill of monumental consequence. It is significant less for what it proposes to do than for its declaration of principles. Section 2 of this bill reads in part as follows: "The Congress hereby declares that—(a) It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce and in the development of the natural resources of the United States; (b) All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right; (c) In order to carry out the policies set forth in sub-sections (a) and (b) of this section, and in order to (1) promote the general welfare of the Nation; (2) foster and protect the American home and the American family as the foundation of the American way of life; (3) raise the standard of living of the American people; (4) provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans; (5) contribute to the full utilization of our national resources; (6) develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; (7) preserve and strengthen competitive private enterprise, particularly small business enterprise; (8) strengthen the national defense and security; and (9) contribute to the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations, it is essential that continuing full employment be maintained in the United States."

This proposal to acknowledge juridically the citizen's *right* to a job is extraordinarily significant and completely sound morally. From the point of view of a hard-boiled economist, such a juridical principle may seem absurd because impractical. But we have no proof from experience that it is impractical, and since the end it seeks to accomplish is obviously desirable, the proposed legislation, we believe, represents one of those gambles which our society must make.

The Murray Bill will be attacked both from the Right and from the Left. The disciples of Marx will accuse it of not going far enough and of placing too much reliance upon free enterprise. Conservatives will call it visionary and will see in it a dire threat to liberty and an increase in the power of government over the daily lives of its citizens. It will be labeled totalitarian by some and weakly conservative by others. Yet it is certainly a notable proposal in its bold juridical novelty, and all but the most diehard of old fashioned capitalists will probably have to grant that it is a step in the right direction. The means whereby the bill proposes to implement its preamble are debatable; the preamble itself comes like a breath of fresh air in our legislative thinking.

The Case of the Flat Hat

THERE used to be two stock charges on which college papers were suspended: youthful humor which was too broad or too suggestive and jibes of various sorts at specified members of the faculty held too biting to be ignored. It was usually good publicity for the paper itself, provided a happy occasion for organized student protest in the name of academic freedom and occasionally won the bold young editors no worse sentences than slightly extended vacations. Such incidents were hugely enjoyed by the generality of the student body and soon blew over. They were the sort of thing long remembered and relished by the "perpetual undergraduate."

It is symptomatic of the times that the temporary suspension of the *Flat Hat* by the William and Mary college authorities had to do with far more serious matters. The point at issue is racial discrimination and it was raised in one of our southern states by a young woman who comes from Michigan. The citation from the offending editorial made in the abbreviated AP dispatch carried in most newspapers quoted only its most sensational phrases without including the qualifying paragraphs with which Miss Kaemmerle set forth the problem as she saw it. Such objectives as having Negroes attend the same classes, belong to the same clubs, room with white fellow-students and even "marry among us" were specifically set forth as not for "today or tomorrow but perhaps the next day. Neither they or we are ready for it yet. Only chaos such as the Southern States experienced during the Reconstruction would result if such a plan were initiated before both Negroes and others were educated for it. . . ." The editorial also dealt at some length with racial differences the world over and minimized them. It closed with an eloquent attack on "nazi race tactics" as an obstacle to any lasting peace. In general, if not in its most extreme details, it was a well-founded and impassioned appeal for carrying out certain inescapable applications of the Christian doctrine of the brotherhood of man.

That the editorial itself should have been written where it was is a hopeful sign. What is even more encouraging is the reaction of the William and Mary student body, a large proportion of them natives of our South. To a man they upheld the right of Miss Kaemmerle to express her opinions without hindrance of faculty censorship. A number of the students who adopted this stand took issue with the editorial in question, but the fact that Northern and Southern students alike backed an editor from the North when she took so forthright a position on this crucial national question augurs well for the American future.

★

In this connection it is important to point out that there is currently grave danger that both major parties may back down now on their November promises to support the continuance of the Fair Employment Practices Commission. The proposal of Senator Taft to provide voluntary rather than mandatory facilities for the settlement of disputes over racial discrimination in matters of employment would in effect remove the protection which FEPC now affords. Democrats and Republicans must be held to their campaign promises in this matter in the common interest.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Five Francs Swiss

OF COURSE it might have been better if it had been seen somewhere else, but it was at a cocktail party that the Swiss five franc piece turned up and it is no use pretending that fighting the war in New York means that there are no cocktail parties, so at this one they were discussing the price ($6,000) for an Utrillo, and then a man pulled out this bright, new Swiss five franc piece and he read the words that were on one side of it. "Mori Malunt Quam Superari." There is no use wondering why a child decides to show you his marbles at one time rather than another, or why the coin was produced with the drinks, and of course the Swiss are not the only people who would rather die than be enslaved—or at least all peoples speak that way, and sometimes a nation can save itself and sometimes it cannot—but the fact is that the coin appeared, with its noble sentiment, and then people talked about what it was worth and they agreed that it was worth about what it said it was worth. It was agreed that the Swiss meant what they said about defending their independence and that they meant also that the coin was worth five francs.

That has always been the trouble. Swiss money is not play money. So that people all over Europe have wanted to take their money to a Swiss bank where something happened to it and then it was real money. Money that you could count, and that would stay there in the Swiss bank and when you took it out you could count it again and the count would still be the same. The attraction exerted by Swiss banks upon loose funds always gave in recent years great pain to the French, the German, the Italian governments, because it showed that their peoples did not like the bank notes they printed with the beautiful designs or the silver coins they made out of tin, and they were always forbidding the export of currency but the peoples of Europe had preserved a vague sort of memory about the days when their ancestors carried gold and silver in little purses, and so when they heard about the Swiss money and the Swiss banks there was no stopping them.

Sometimes you could stop them but not often. One day at the frontier at Ferney-Voltaire there was a wonderful shiny Bugatti with Lyons plates on her, and the French customs guards left their game of bowls for a moment; they joined the guard who was supposed to search the car for money; they asked how many miles to the gallon and that sort of question, admiringly; they were just waving on the car when a clerk came out from his files of cows, milk and cheeses, and said we have had a phone call about that car and then they found a million or so in a fake exhaust pipe, and a million or so in a double bottom in the gas tank, and they had to arrest everybody in the car, and the car stayed there for a year or so until it was sold at auction, and then the war came and the army requisitioned the car. But most of the time the money got through to Geneva where there was always a long line of French people standing in the banks waiting to make deposits. In Basel it was Germans. Fewer Germans. Because the German customs guards were less fascinated by the game of bowls. In Lausanne it would be Italians too, and very romantic because so often they were at least a marchesa bringing Ciano's funds out, or somebody's, and they traveled in the Simplon-Orient Express which was romantic in itself.

It was not patriotic, this rush of money to Switzerland, but it represented a healthy old fashioned idea about money and, anyway, who could blame the Swiss for inspiring confidence because they were honest?

The Swiss were honest and serious about all their contracts. They were always that way. They have been that way all through the war. They mobilized their army, because that was in the contract they had made with Europe concerning their neutrality. They were prepared to fight, because that was in the contract. Clearly understood by all concerned, always. They shot down planes that crossed their borders. American planes. They furnished no instruments of war to Germany or to France. That also was in the contract. They refused to repair German war material. They refused transit to German war material proceeding from Germany to Italy; they allowed coal to pass through the St. Gothard from Germany to Italy. Because that had been in the contract when they built the tunnel. When it looked as if the Germans were winning the Swiss paid exactly no more attention to the German demands than they had paid before. The Swiss are very brave about their contracts.

The Swiss are encircled and now the pressure is being brought against them from this side and not from the other side. It is very remarkable and very wonderful that they do not now say that it is obvious who is winning the war and that they would like to join the winning side. It is extraordinary, but true, however, that they are still thinking about the contract they have made to remain neutral and free.

Mr. Laughlin Currie, together with somebody from the British Foreign Office and a man from Paris, is now in Bern telling the Swiss that it is time now that we finished the war so why not help us. That means no coal, no nothing, to Italy, or Germany. And what about this money that you have in your banks?

The Swiss say: "What about the contract a free people has made and intends to honor?"

C. G. PAULDING.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peacetime Military Training

An army private asks some questions

WE are told that peacetime compulsory military training will (1) strengthen the defenses of the United States, (2) improve the health of the American people, (3) give our citizens a sense of civic responsibility and pride, (4) cut down crime, (5) help to solve the unemployment problem, (6) provide valuable skills and experience to generations of young Americans.

Much of this reasoning and the philosophy behind it have a historic past. In fact they could be almost lifted from orthodox Prussian thinking. Take, for example, Prussian General Friedrich von Bernhardi's "Germany and the Next War," published in 1914; here we see basic similarities between the contemporary American campaign and the pattern of German militarism. Let us examine the similarity between von Bernhardi's words and those of our own leading advocates of compulsory military training in peacetime. And let us preface our study with a sentence from another German, Clausewitz. "A people can only hope to take up a firm position in the political world when national character and military tradition act and react upon each other."

Mrs. Roosevelt is reported by the New York *Times* as having said at a luncheon given in the Horace Mann-Lincoln School, "If we're going to have compulsory military training after the war then it should be for boys and girls and it should provide training in citizenship responsibility. Our youngsters must all get into their minds that they have a responsibility to their country, and they should spend that year or so in developing such knowledge within themselves. Boys and girls have to have the feeling that they've done something for the community. Schools have fallen down terribly in giving children ideas about practical self-government."

The late Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, developed the same thesis. "I believe that a system of national military training would pay swift dividends in a healthier, more unified, more democratic nation, and one able to defend itself more quickly and efficiently should we ever again be attacked." He goes on in his *Collier's* article to speak of "a year's demonstration in duty."

Early in 1944, speaking in Cleveland, the Secretary said: "And now we come to the third important link in the task of building a strong and virile America in the future. It has to do with the young man when he reaches the age when military service can be expected of him in time of war—say 17 and 19 years of age. Normally that would be about the age most boys finish high school and either go to work or go to college. That would be the ideal time in a boy's life when a year of his time should be given to his country for the purpose of training physically and spiritually for citizenship the first duty of which is service in defense of his country in case of emergency."

There will be more words from Americans. Let us now turn to von Bernhardi. "Military service not only educates nations in warlike capacity, but it develops the intellectual and moral qualifications generally for the occupations of peace. It educates a man to the full mastery of his body, to the exercise and improvement of his muscles; it develops his mental powers, his self-reliance and readiness of decision; it accustoms him to order and subordination for a common end; it elevates his self-respect and courage, and thus his capacity for every kind of work. It is a quite perverted view that the time devoted to military service deprives economic life of forces which could have been more appropriately and more profitably employed elsewhere. These forces are not withdrawn from economic life, but are trained for economic life. Military training produces intellectual and moral forces which richly repay the time spent, and have their real value in subsequent life. It is therefore the moral duty of the State to train as many of its countrymen as possible in the use of arms, not only with the prospect of war, but that they may share in the benefits of military service, and improve their physical and moral capacities of defense. The sums which the State applies to the military training of the nation are distinctly an outlay for social purposes; the money so spent serves social and educative ends, and raises the nation spiritually and morally; it thus promotes the highest aims of civilization more directly than achievements of mechanics, industries, trades, and commerce. . . ."

★

Obviously when von Bernhardi speaks of "the highest aims of civilization" he has in mind some-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing entirely different from the democratic civilization we are fighting this war to preserve. Apparently the same means serves two contradictory ideals.

War to Bernhardi is not evil; it is the most virile expression of a country's prowess and honor. Democracy to Bernhardi is a luxury for decadent peoples. But why do the words balance? Why is the reasoning similar?

Mr. Stimson points out that youth "will have the benefits of a system of physical culture and will develop disciplined habits, which will add to their health and future life expectancy." In short, "they will receive more than they give."

Mr. Forrestal has said that his own observations convinced him that service in either the army or the navy was a practical preparation for citizenship.

For citizenship in Germany, for citizenship in Japan, for citizenship in any country regardless of basic political philosophy and fundamental ideals?

General von Bernhardi: "It is in the direct interests of the State to raise the physical health of the town population by all imaginable means, not only in order to enable more soldiers to be enlisted, but to bring beneficial effect of military training more extensively to bear on the town population, and so to help to make our social conditions more healthy. Nothing promotes unity of spirit and sentiment like the comradeship of military service."

Stressing the mental and physical inadequacy of the present educational system, Brigadier General Walter L. Weible, director of military training, has recently said that military instruction had to be delayed in the army while men were taught what they were fighting for and why discipline was necessary. "Will you tell me why the Army should be forced to utilize military training time to teach youth the background of the war and give them adequate understanding of why we fight?" he asked. "You send these youths to the Army and you direct us to transform them into well-trained effective soldiers in a tragically short time."

This is an important judgment. Our educational system is indicted and indicted by the Army and by educators for not producing more patriotic soldiers.

★

General Friedrich von Bernhardi made the same point. "It is significant of the knowledge of our national history which the school imparts that out of sixty-three recruits of one company to whom the question was put who Bismarck was, not a single one could answer. That the scholars acquire even a general idea of their duties to the country and the State is quite out of the question."

Or again, ". . . a school, to be fruitful in results, must endeavour, not only to prevent the scholar from forgetting what he once learnt, and to qualify him for a special branch of work, but, above all, to develop his patriotism and sense of citizenship. To do this, it is necessary to explain to him the relation of the State to the individual and to explain, by reference to our national history, how the individual can only prosper by devovotion to the State."

Just what should be done to make certain that our soldiers will know why to fight in the next war? Let us make a quick survey of certain sections of typical American thought on the desirability of compulsory military training.

Major General R. C. Berkeley: "I am thoroughly of the opinion that one year of military training for youth . . . would not only be of great military value to the country, but would be of inestimable value to the individual youths, both from a physical and a disciplinary sense."

Major General Lewis B. Hershey: "I am convinced that for the male youth of this country a minimum of one year should be given to development and training primarily for the purpose of national preservation. This would result in many secondary benefits: Physical conditioning and rehabilitation, practice in healthful living and a schooling in democracy."

Now General von Bernhardi: "The fact is often forgotten that military service and the observance of national duty of bearing arms are in themselves a high moral gain for people, and improve the strength and capacity for work."

Does General von Bernhardi mean by "a high moral gain" that the people will be more easily manageable, more docile? Exactly what do he and Mr. Atherton of the American Legion mean by the word *moral*? And what is this important relationship between *morality* and *discipline*?

General von Bernhardi breathes the faith crystalized in Schiller's poem which he quoted in his chapter, "The Right to Make War."

> Man is stunted by peaceful days,
> In idle repose his courage decays.
> Law is the weakling's game,
> Law makes the world the same.
> But in war man's strength is seen,
> War ennobles all that is mean;
> Even the coward belies his name.

But surely the men of public note whom we have quoted do not endorse this creed. Why then is there this basic similarity? Why the same recurring thoughts? Is this just symptomatic of a thoughtless scramble for ideas to push through military training legislation, or is there a more fundamental reason for such parallel ideas? Can the same institution of compulsory military training serve at once the ideas of the fascist state and the ideas of American democracy? What is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

behind the innocent phrase "citizen's obligations?" Does it mean what von Bernhardi has in mind when he says, "The duties of the individual to the State should be placed in the foreground. This instruction must be inspired by the spirit which animated Schleiermacher's sermons in the blackest hour of Prussia, and culminated in the doctrine that all the value of the man lies in the strength and purity of his will, in his free devotion to the great whole; that property and life are only trust, which must be employed for higher ideals; that the mind, which thinks only of itself perishes in feeble susceptibility, but that true moral worth grows up only in the love of the fatherland and for the State, which is a haven for every faith, and a home of justice and honourable freedom of purpose."

Are the reasons alleged by our Americans—so similar to those of Bernhardi—in this discussion of compulsory military training mere embroidery, being only a dexterous maneuver to appeal to the imagination of the people in order to rally them behind a program similar to the Prussian's? Does the difference between von Bernhardi's *State* and our *state* truly negate the common emphasis and logic, or does it create a certain confusion regarding the political and moral orientation of our American leadership?

A civilian's views on the subject

J. M. O'Neill

THERE seems to be real danger that we are going to drift—just drift—into the tragic blunder of adopting peacetime compulsory military training in the United States. This will be a two-fold change in "the American way of life"—the change itself and the way it is being brought about. The case for this revolution is being neither explained nor argued. It is just being *assumed* or prophesied or endorsed. Vice Admiral Jacobs, Chief of Naval Personnel, brazenly asks for *acceptance without discussion*. The New York *Times* quotes him in these Hitlerian sentences: "I hope the need for universal military training will not become obscured by heat and passion. I hope it will be *faced as a simple fact*. A circumstance of life in the twentieth century, *not to be contended over, but simply to be recognized*." (Italics mine.)

We are being told to hurry, not to stop to think or to talk about it. The War and Navy Departments, again with no serious attempt at justification, ask us to adopt this policy *now*, before the soldiers can get back to tell the Congress what they think of it. This avoidance of the techniques of rational discussion in an attempt to put over a sweeping reversal of American policy in a cloud of assumptions and oracular pronouncements, will, if it succeeds, mean that we have already abandoned the methods of a democracy to accept without questioning the *political* leadership of generals and admirals and their civilian echoes. We should be warned that such echoes sound particularly loud and clear in the heavy atmosphere of war.

Apparently some people are endorsing universal military training on the very dangerous assumption that it will not be military training at all, but just good education, general or vocational, spread over the nation by a benign Federal government. The President's remark about the possibility of something like the CCC camps is no guarantee that a successful drive for military training will result in anything but military training.

The prophecies, as distinct from the assumptions, seem to rely (if on anything at all) on the *Fortune* survey of last July. In this survey, while 61.4 percent voted for a draft of all young men as opposed to a volunteer army, 42.0 percent voted that a volunteer army would be large enough for the country's needs, and 42.3 percent voted that a volunteer army would not be large enough. This seems to indicate somewhat confused thinking on the part of the public or none at all. There is, of course, no indication that *Fortune* offers this poll as a record of opinion resulting from either accurate information or careful thought. Since we obviously cannot know on what premises or assumptions the answers to the poll questions were given, the poll has little value as evidence that the public wants what is provided for in any specific legislation now or in the future to be introduced in Congress, and it clearly has no value whatever as evidence that such legislation expresses a wise or helpful policy.

★

Compulsory peacetime military service has wrecked lives, broken up families, and made men hate and flee from their native lands in country after country for generations. What good has it ever done any country? Where has it ever promoted patriotism? Freedom? Security? What peace has it ensured? What war prevented? What victory won? If anyone knows the answers we should have them. If no one knows the answers, we should not have peacetime universal military training in America. If the proponents of this scheme have any facts that support it,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they should publish them and stop spinning assumptions that violate the facts of history and of the world today.

Mr. George Soule in the *New Republic* writes "many nations have had universal service without losing their democracy thereby." It would be interesting to have a list of the many, with dates of the periods of universal service. Above all we should have from someone who wants universal service a list of the nations that have ever avoided a war or won a war in recent centuries by having universal military training in peace time (except, of course, when war was *immediately* threatening).

General Marshall has endorsed the program. Mr. Soule "agrees with General Marshall," but apparently with considerable pain. The New York *Times* for December 1, in a somersaulting editorial which deftly escapes collision with a single fact, also contrives to evolve a nebulous case for military training for all American youth in peacetime.

On the other side the Catholic Bishops of the United States, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, numerous distinguished educators and bodies of educators have in recent months issued statements against this proposal. In many of these releases one can find references to well known facts regarding such matters as the present state of the world, and present plans for improving the state of the world.

Vital questions, such as the best age for soldiers, the permanence of any good results of one year of training for boys of eighteen, the general education, technical training, and time required for air force and other branches, the proper defense against rocket bombs, and the relation of these matters to each other and to the date of the next world war—these considerations are slipped over without comment by our military fortune tellers. Particularly the part that time should play in all our plans is not discussed. For instance, the soldiers of World War III, if it takes a decade to get going after World War II ends, will not yet be ten years old in the early years of the short peace; if World War III waits twenty years, its best soldiers will be little babies, or not yet born, when the universal training enthusiasts want to start getting them ready for battle. The oracles know we will need tremendous armed forces, but they do not know when, or how many, or what kind. Such imperfect clairvoyance is not convincing.

★

The advocates of a decision now to continue compulsory service in peacetime immediately after this war is over seem already to have walked out on the peace. They must assume something like one or more of the following: that the present war is largely futile, or is going to be essentially lost, that nothing much will come of current sacrifices, that World War III is now in the making, that the world has learned nothing and can't cooperate for peace, that "we must fight Russia" (or England), that we will surely return to normalcy, come 1948.

Only a convinced defeatist can be sure *now* that we will need universal compulsory military service immediately after this war is over. Except on the defeatist assumption, there cannot be a need for millions more of trained soldiers so quickly that we cannot wait to see what the results of World War II will be. Moreover, even the best defeatist would have difficulty in showing how the particular kind of defense that will be most needed in the next world war could result from one year of military training of all youth, or even how it could be greatly helped by such a plan.

If one catches an apologist for compulsory military training outside of the breastworks of his editorials and official releases and is able to get him away from his assumptions in regard to the next war, he is sure to hear something like this: "Oh, but think of the benefit to the young men, in discipline, in patriotism, in education, in health." Back of this answer is an almost complete disregard of ordinary facts that are within the reach of any observant citizen of this country. The contention that military training for all American youth is, *per se,* good for education, patriotism, health, or discipline is wholly absurd. Anyone can know this either inductively or deductively.

For a quarter of a century we have been living with hundreds of thousands of veterans of the last war. Every reader of this article will know quite a few of them. Every Congressman will know many of them, and will know the official spokesmen of thousands more. Consider these veterans. How much better disciplined are they than their neighbors who had no military training? How much better are they in health than those who had no life in an army camp? Are they better citizens in any way? Better educated, more thoughtful in civic affairs, more patriotic, more tolerant, more devoted to the liberty for which they were trained to fight? Of course not. Neither as individuals, nor as organized groups, are the veterans of the last war better than the men who did not get the army training. Probably not three percent of the mature men and women of the country will differ with this statement. This is not to say that the veterans are any worse. They are neither better nor worse. They are just like all the rest of us. Some are intelligent, some are not; some are well behaved, some are not; some are criminals, some are not. They were trained to be good soldiers. They were good soldiers. Then they stopped being soldiers, and their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

training as soldiers has meant nothing of any importance to them or to others that anyone is able to identify or measure. They have very happy memories of their youth as soldiers, some of them. Just as some other men, most other men, have happy memories of their youth as non-soldiers. Youth is a good time to look back on when one has passed it by for a few decades. But we should not generalize from too few instances carefully selected in wartime, when so much of the best of all for which we have lived is in uniform, to the silly conclusion that a year or more spent in uniform helps significantly to prepare youth for the right kind of mature life as free men. That generalization will not stand the test of an inductive examination of the veterans of the last war or of any other war.

Nor will it stand a deductive examination. Army discipline fits nothing, prepares for nothing but army life. It never has prepared, and does not now prepare, for that self-discipline which is the only kind that is of any importance in a free society, where each man is "on his own" until the law catches up with him. Army discipline quite properly fits the atmosphere of the barracks and the battlefield. Moreover, it fits the atmosphere of all dictatorships. But it cannot, from its very nature, make any worthwhile contribution to the lives of free and responsible citizens. It helps to make a good soldier; it has not helped, and cannot help, to make a good anything else.

★

In training or education for enlightened and responsible citizenship, we need the exact opposite of the complete, unquestioning obedience that is the inevitable and wholly proper characteristic of all military training. Obviously the Army cannot allow privates, trainees, students, to doubt, question, or correct the officers. Many, many times the privates, trainees, student-soldiers know much more about the subject than the officer who is trying to teach it. At such times the young soldiers get some training in ability to conceal disgust, contempt, amusement at the ignorance or ineptitude of their "superiors." This is not only not good education; it is the antithesis of education. The point to be stressed is that any system *in which this sort of thing can happen,* even once in a while, though it may train good soldiers, is an abomination from the standpoint of training citizens. It is an outrage from the standpoint of education.

Even in the poorest educational institutions outside the Army, instructors would not be tolerated of the sort who go on undiscovered—or at least unremoved—in the army. The reason is perfectly clear. Outside the armed forces no student would be jeopardizing his whole career (perhaps his freedom and his reputation) by reporting such conduct to some department head, dean or president. The teaching profession, of course, has plenty of incompetents in it, as have all other populous professions, including the military. In no reputable school or college, however, could one find two consecutive weeks of teaching, training, discipline, as bad as some that goes on without let or hindrance in the Army. This is not the fault of an occasional poor officer or weak administrator. It is a wholly inevitable aspect of the army system. We cannot have tremendously expanded, wholesale army training without it, because the only possible guarantee against it (allowing the student-soldier freedom to differ, debate, correct, and report) would wreck any good army. The absence of such freedom would wreck any good school or college. This absolute and vital difference should never be forgotten when we are tempted to think of the Army as an educational agency.

The American Army, Navy, Marine Corps, train men to be superlative fighters. Everyone knows that—including the German High Command. Whenever this training is necessary to the defense of the nation, we should all accept it, of course, along with all the other sacrifices of war. We should grin and bear it—as the young men in the Army do who have been well brought up, well trained in self-discipline, before going into the Army. Some of the others blow up and land in the guard house or worse. This also has to be accepted as part of the cost of war. Obviously, if we can have only a world in which every man needs always to be ready to fight to the death with other men, peacetime universal military training can be justified—always provided, of course, that one is ready to grant that such a world is worth living in and, therefore, worth fighting and dying for. Even so, no one who knows anything about military training and about education should ever be expected to believe that the former ever can or ever does make a significant contribution to the latter.

The truth is that the Army and Navy have never done very much high grade educational work of any kind, except as they have drawn in men from the colleges and universities, put them in uniform, and let them continue the work they have been doing out of uniform for years. Of course, you do not ruin a teacher by putting him in uniform; and neither do you make a teacher out of an ignoramus by putting *him* in uniform. It may be possible to make "an officer and a gentleman" by act of Congress. It is impossible to make a teacher that way. But you can ruin a good student sometimes by putting him in uniform and requiring him to stop thinking. You can easily do lasting damage to many boys of eighteen by subjecting them to complete, severe, and sometimes stupid discipline under circumstances in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which the boys have no motivation to help them to support the discipline—no great emotional investment in patriotism, loyalty, or duty, as in *peacetime* military training. The fuss that has been made occasionally about the "discovery" that soldiers learn a language more quickly when they study it fifty hours a week than other students do when they study it three or six hours a week (which teachers have always known) is typical of the absurdities accepted by some people in a glow of wartime enthusiasm about the Army as an educational institution.

"But think of the fine health service and physical training!" This is usually the last argument (if and when they argue) of the advocates for universal military service. The idea that selecting the physically fit young men of eighteen years and giving them health service and physical training for one year will be of any significant value to the nation is somewhat sillier than the assumption that military training has a value in education or in citizenship. This is true because health is a fairly definite, tangible, unambiguous sort of thing. When army officers and editors talk about health, therefore, they ought to realize that something better than simple assumptions could be dealt with if they were so inclined. Almost any honest doctor, in or out of the Army, would tell them that the best time to prepare for a healthy manhood is in childhood. If the Federal Government wishes to do something about the health of the youth of America it should start by helping to provide that all children are so fed and cared for that at eighteen so many of them will not be sickly, undeveloped, dull illiterates who can't pass an army test. We should not be so concerned about the eighteen year olds who are most fit. We should think rather of those who were so unfortunate as to be born in "depressed areas," or even in depressed families, and who arrive at their eighteenth birthdays sans eyes, sans teeth, sans muscles, morals, brains, sans everything of basic value to themselves or to the nation as foundations for a decent, happy, and useful life. If we will invest a few millions in saving the children who are now being sacrificed to ignorance and penury, we will be making an investment that will pay dividends in both peace and war.

Dumbarton Oaks

What it is and what it should be

Luigi Sturzo

PUBLIC discussion, in England and in the United States, on the respective international policies of these countries and recent political events in Europe has raised hopes for a better future. The General International Organization, as proposed in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, cannot be a living thing unless it is animated by a political and moral content that will shape its very nature. For there is no constitution, national or international, which can live only on its own structure, as an end in itself, like a machine that is not fed workable material.

History shows us that every time the constitution of a political body has been framed, it was done with specific moral and political aims to rivet it to the nation, as was the case especially in America and in France in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Among such aims, liberty, independence, and unification were the ideals that were to awaken, in the people, a consciousness of their own personality. But, at the same time, special classes, interested groups, oppressed minorities and military castes sought their own personal ends, so that the best ideals suffered through misuse by those who turned moral values to their special advantage. It is sufficient to remember the Reign of Terror of the French Revolution, the refusal of England to give Ireland home rule, the question of slavery and the war of secession in the United States, the system of military pronunciamentos in Spain and the Hispano-American countries, the social struggle in Europe and in America between capital and labor.

What happened in individual nations can happen in the international organization. The League of Nations was the first experience. Dumbarton Oaks will follow. It is the duty of those who have a more effective share in political life and more direct responsibility for their countrymen to contribute, not only in shaping the constitution of the future general International Organization (avoiding, of course, what is now called "perfectionism") but, what is more important, in basing it on moral principles, on a stable policy and on concomitant social and economic aims.

★

It is obvious that public opinion in America

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS from

FOR LENT

1. THE NEW TESTAMENT IN ENGLISH

Translated by Msgr. RONALD KNOX. A new translation, not a revision of existing translations. The famous scripture scholar has achieved three things: fidelity to the original, clarity of meaning and purity of style. **$3.00**

2. SPEAKING OF HOW TO PRAY

By MARY PERKINS. Another deeply human and Catholic book by Mary Perkins. She takes both the Church's theology and the liturgy and blends them into the life of the layman. **$2.75**

3. THE REED OF GOD

By CARYLL HOUSELANDER. All that we know of Our Lady is re-examined to find what can be learned from her by ordinary people for the living of their ordinary lives in the world. **$2.00**

4. THIS WAR IS THE PASSION

By CARYLL HOUSELANDER. With modern directness of expression and mediaeval simplicity of faith the author writes of this war, of what it is doing to men, of how it should draw them all together as fellow members of the mystical body of Christ crucified. **$2.00**

5. SPLENDOR OF SORROW

By EDDIE DOHERTY. A Chicago newspaperman brings to the assignment of describing the seven sorrows of Our Lady a vivid pen and a heart filled with love of Mary. **$1.50**

6. SECRETS OF THE SAINTS

By HENRI GHÉON. A Ghéon omnibus which brings four of the famous hagiographer's best biographies —The Secret of the Curé D'Ars, The Secret of the Little Flower, the Secret of Don Bosco and The Secret of Margaret Mary—together in one volume. **$3.00**

7. CONFESSIONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Translated by F. J. SHEED. A new translation of Books I to XIII which is winning new friends for the classic autobiography of one of the most learned and one of the most human of the saints. **$3.00**

8. AT YOUR EASE IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

By MARY PERKINS. A book of "etiquette for Catholics," answering dozens of such questions as to how to address a Bishop, what is expected of a Godmother and how to manage a Missal. **$2.00**

FOR HOLY WEEK

9. THE HOUR OF BARABBAS

By OTTO MICHAEL. The Passion seen through the eyes of Barabbas, the man the mob chose for liberation instead of Christ. This unusual book is a source of new matter for meditation on the sufferings of Our Lord. **$1.00**

10. RADIO REPORTER IN JERUSALEM

By MALARD, SUZANNE and CITA. Translated by F. J. SHEED. A very successful radio play about a reporter who miraculously turns up with his microphone in first-century Jerusalem and broadcasts the events of the first Holy Week. **$1.50**

11. ROYAL ROAD

By ARTHUR KUHL. A novel the theme of which makes the doctrine of the mystical body vividly real. A young negro laborer suffers in the slums of our own American cities a passion parallel to that which redeemed the world. **$2.00**

FOR EASTER PRESENTS

12. CONVENT BOARDING SCHOOL

By VIRGINIA KENNY. Life in a convent boarding school. Charmingly written and a needed antidote to much modern writing about convent education. **$2.00**

13. DARK SYMPHONY

By ELIZABETH LAURA ADAMS. An eminently readable autobiography in which a young negro girl lets us share an almost idyllic childhood in a charming home, and shows us a talented and sensitive college-trained girl finding it hard to get a job as a servant-maid. There is no bitterness in the book. It is easy to read, but not easy to forget. **$2.50**

14. THEY ARE PEOPLE

By Sister MARIELLA GABLE, O.S.B. A varied and balanced choice of short stories about nuns, monks and priests by such authors as Katherine Mansfield, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway, Morley Callaghan and others. **$3.00**

15. DAMIEN THE LEPER

By JOHN FARROW. The life of Father Damien, with its background of the most beautiful of all scenery and the most loathsome of all diseases, needed an artist and has found one. **$2.50**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHEED & WARD

16. LIFE TOGETHER

By WINGFIELD HOPE. Wingfield Hope writes from experience to fellow members of the laity in this warmly human and solidly Catholic book on God's pattern for marriage and the practical following of that pattern by husband and wife. **$2.50**

17. GILBERT KEITH CHESTERTON

By MAISIE WARD. Seven years of painstaking research in primary sources have produced this balanced, objective, and comprehensive portrait of Gilbert Chesterton. It has been warmly received both by devoted readers of Chesterton and by those who were his personal friends. **$4.50**

18. PAGEANT OF THE POPES

By JOHN FARROW. A popular history of all the popes from Peter to Pius XII written frankly and with an eye for colorful details. Illus. **$3.50**

19. GALL AND HONEY

By EDDIE DOHERTY. The lively, even hectic, autobiography of an ace reporter which is also a beautifully rounded twentieth-century variation on the eternal hound of heaven theme. **$2.75**

FOR THE CHILDREN

20. MARY, MY MOTHER

By Sister MARY JEAN, O.P. A life of Our Blessed Mother for the very young. Delightfully illustrated in silhouette by the author. **$1.00**

21. THE CHURCH'S PLAY

By GRACE HURRELL. A new idea for teaching children to realize the Mass. After going through the Masses of the principal seasons of the year, the Mass itself is examined, always preserving the notion of a drama. Illus. **$1.50**

22. A LIFE OF OUR LORD FOR CHILDREN

By MARIGOLD HUNT. The book begins with an account of what happened prior to Our Lord's coming. Then we have the life itself. The author has a very special knack of putting across the thrill of the Gospel narrative for Children. Illus. **$1.75**

23. ROSE OF AMERICA

By SARA MAYNARD. A life of the Peruvian girl saint, Rose of Lima, which may well bring our young people to a closer understanding of their South American neighbors. Illus. **$2.00**

By MARY FABYAN WINDEATT:

24. HERO OF THE HILLS

This life for young readers of St. Benedict, who carried on his heroic apostolate in the war-torn Europe of fourteen hundred years ago, is written with great historical accuracy. Illus. **$1.75**

25. LAD OF LIMA

The simple Negro Dominican laybrother, Blessed Martin de Porres, has a happy knack of winding himself around the hearts of all who come to know him. Illus. **$1.75**

26. SAINTS IN THE SKY

A life of St. Catherine of Siena who is a grand saint for children because she began being a saint so young, and had the art to be a saint without ceasing to be a child. Illus. **$1.25**

27. WARRIOR IN WHITE

The story of John Masias, another Dominican laybrother who became a friend of Blessed Martin de Porres and in his white Dominican habit was a real warrior against the social wrongs of the seventeenth century. Illus. **$1.75**

By JOAN WINDHAM:

28. SIX O'CLOCK SAINTS

Stories designed to introduce the saints to small children, as people they would love to have known, or to be like. It is good for children to realize young how likeable the saints are. Illus. **$1.25**

29. MORE SAINTS FOR SIX O'CLOCK

More stories of the delightful doings of eighteen saints. Illus. **$1.75**

By FRANCES MARGARET FOX:

30. GAY LEGENDS OF THE SAINTS

Making clear that her stories are only legends, the author succeeds in portraying to her young readers the gayness of Sanctity. Illus. **$1.50**

31. LEGENDS OF THE CHRIST CHILD

These legends of the boy Jesus re-create the joy and happiness which must have surrounded Bethlehem and Nazareth. Illus. **$1.50**

Please send me the following books:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28
29 30 31

(circle the numbers of those you want)

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Send C.O.D.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....ZONE.....STATE.....

At your bookseller's, or

SHEED & WARD, Dept. C
63 Fifth Avenue New York 3, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(and also in other countries) is divided between those I would call *democratic internationalists* and the *authoritarian realists*. The former note that the General Assembly of States, as proposed at Dumbarton Oaks, would be reduced to a more or less decorative function. Through the provisions of Chapter Five, this assembly may *consider* the general principles of cooperation in maintaining the peace and international security; it may discuss every question involved; it may *make recommendations* in this connection; but that is all it can do. Whenever it is necessary to *deliberate* and to *execute* (in connection with any of the purposes of the "Organization") the Security Council must be resorted to; the Assembly can never have a voice or interfere in what is the exclusive and absolute concern of the Council.

Moreover, only on the *recommendation* of the Council, may new member states be received by the Assembly; only upon such *recommendation* can states be suspended from the rights or privileges of the Organization as member-states, having perhaps failed to live up to their obligations.

Even in economic, social or other matters of non-political nature, the Assembly must limit itself *to making recommendations*. Thus, from the paralyzing system of a legislative Assembly with the rule of unanimity for political or otherwise important affairs, as was the case at Geneva, we jump to the opposite—a consultative, powerless Assembly, indeed a sort of minor, under guardianship.

The old Assembly was anti-democratic, because every state, however small, through the rule of unanimity would affirm its independent sovereignty, and was thus able to impose its veto on the suggestions of all the other states. The new Assembly will also be undemocratic, because the individual states will have, by constitutional rule, renounced all deliberative power by investing it in the Security Council.

Therefore, the Catholic Bishops of America, in their considered, well balanced and on the whole favorable declaration concerning the General International Organization, have opportunely affirmed that this organization "must try to include, with due regard for the basic equality of rights, all the large and small, strong and weak nations" and that "its constitution must be democratic."

Opposed to this democratic conception are those who fear the weakening of the Security Council, which would remain at the mercy of the Assembly and of its majorities, which might prove intensely variable, in response to the fluctuating interests of the States. These people assert (and it seems that their opinion is becoming the prevailing one in America) that the direction of international peace must be the concern of the three great Powers, because on them has fallen and will fall in the future responsibility of preventing any possible world war.

I said three, because China (which is among the great States with a right to a permanent seat in the Council) has not yet surmounted the crisis of war and internal weakness, and because France, admitted at the ninth hour, has not yet had complete parity with the first three.

Actually, America, Great Britain and Russia feel that they hold all power in their hands. The other two associates will eventually succeeed in asserting themselves, but it seems natural that, for the time being, the *yes* or the *no* of America or Russia, and relatively that of Great Britain, have greater weight than that of France or China. In any case a pentarchy is now in the making, and its power will dominate the world.

★

The Dumbarton Oaks plan includes no precise method for voting in the Security Council, because agreement was not reached on this point. We know that the most debated point at the Conference was the Russian proposal, designed to guarantee the right to vote to a state itself interested in the question to be decided. This proposal was made in opposition to another, formulated during the course of the discussion, which provided that deliberations of the Council would require for validification not only the prescribed majority, but also the unanimous vote of the five states with permanent seats, except in cases where one or more of the members of the Council (even those with permanent seats) were interested.

To require unanimity on the part of the five permanent members seems perilous to many, because it attributes to one of them alone a veto which could stall the international machinery. However, the defenders of such a provision assume that peace can be maintained in the world only if the great powers, which will have means and armies at their disposal, keep united, even in the procedure of deliberation, so as to find, in permanent cooperation, a course of action which will lead them to rise above their special points of view and their national interests. To me this seems rather a veto privilege, agreed upon beforehand, which will always make the stronger of the five prevail over the weaker, whether the latter be States with permanent seats or elective seats, or States not belonging to the Council. A more suitable formula for a necessary, although limited, functional dynamism of this Council, would be to set at three (on secondary questions) or four (on major questions) the minimum necessary votes of States with permanent seats; and at three and four, respectively, of States with elective seats. Thus the right to disagree would not be suppressed by maneuvers, nor would it become dominant over all the rest, like a veto.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The most dangerous of the measures agreed on at Dumbarton Oaks, concerning the privileges of the five great powers, involves the constitution of the General International Organization itself. Any possible, or necessary, amendment (and there can be no perfect constitution, good forever) will have to be adopted by two-thirds of the Assembly and ratified by each individual State in accordance with its legislative procedure; and such amendments will go into effect only if ratification is obtained from all the five States with permanent seats, plus the majority of the other States.

This measure tends to block from the outset any really useful modification; any single one of the five permanent States can make any attempt at modification futile, while all the other States, large and small, if they believe their rights have been infringed (and up to now they have very few recognized rights) will have to join in a coalition, forming half plus one (30 or more States) in order to obtain the desired effect.

There is even more to this: the veto weapon may even be used by the parliamentary minorities of some of the States, each of which must ratify the proposal. If, for example, the United States of America keeps the two-thirds rule for the ratification of such amendments, the hostile vote of one-third plus one of the Senate will be enough to defeat the proposed amendment, despite the favorable vote of all the member States. What may be said of the United States may also be said of Russia or China, of Great Britain or France, according to their present or future constitutions and parliamentary rules of procedure.

The objection here raised is so serious that it should lead the proponent States to rigorous clarification before such a constitution is imposed on the Assembly of the United Nations.

★

There is another much debated point, the lack of regulating and directive principles, to guide the activity of the Security Council. The points of the Atlantic Charter, which today bear the signature of all the United Nations, have not been incorporated or mentioned in the present proposals; nor has the Assembly been granted any directive power, nor has there been any mention of traditional international law and of agreements previously established, not even as rules to be kept in mind by the International Court in its decision.

I agree with those who say that all this is presupposed, but in such a way as not to hamper the action of the Security Council, and permit in such a way as to the fitting of circumstances to principles to come about in a spontaneous manner and not in some preestablished form. It is necessary, indeed, to avoid rigid formulations and too precise pledges, but not in such a way as to go to the other extreme, where a lack of rules and laws will make easier the use of arbitrary power and opportunism.

One of the points which will necessarily have previously to be established—and established in a constitutional form—is the definition of an aggressor, so that all the nations may know, even those nations who are to be outside the organization, under what conditions they may suffer international sanctions.

Not only should the nation which in fact resorts to arms, attacking another nation, be considered an aggressor; but a nation which exceeds armament limitations, agreed upon in common or imposed by decision, must be considered potentially an aggressor. And any nation which, having been required by the Security Council to carry out some measure necessary for the maintenance of peace, does not do so, must likewise be considered and treated as an aggressor. That such nations may be in the right cannot serve as a justification for them; because, if they have a claim against another nation or against the International Organization itself, they must resort to friendly mediation, or to arbitration, or they must seek the decision of a competent Court; never must they make use of force, breaking pacts and violating collective discipline.

Any nation which does not belong to the General International Organization, which is also not a neutral nation, and which has not made agreements with the Security Council, will likewise have to be considered *potentially* an aggressor. I say which is not *neutral,* because such a nation (e.g., Switzerland) would constitute no threat to the peace of the other nations. But in all other cases, a nation can constitute a threat, present or future, and it must be treated as such, until it is induced either to enter the organization and submit to its laws, or to make agreements directed toward not disturbing the peace and therefore toward peacefully settling all disputes which may arise.

There remains the case of resistance to an aggressor. It is clear that one may resist an armed assault and in certain cases one must resist, though *cum moderamine inculpatae tutelae,* as the ancients used to say. At the same time, the nation assailed will have to resort to the Security Council, putting the case up to its decision. The ultimate resistance cannot be classified as war, nor can the armed intervention of the nations called by the Security Council to the defense be classified as war. It would only be a question, in the first case, of an opposition in force to an act of violence, and in the second of police intervention.

It is true that a war between rebellious nations and the General International Organization might occur in the future, just as was the case in America when the Southern States seceded. This would not be a legitimate war, but one of those revolts

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the central authority which, just as they sometimes occur in the case of partisan factions within a nation, could occur for various reasons in an international organization as well. It would be imprudent not to foresee such rebellions and prevent them in time, but it would also be foolish to feed the resentment of small nations and of minority groups with the injustice of the big nations, or to reduce an organization which is of a moral and juridical nature to an oligarchy of a few well-armed nations. The new Organization will have to be so strong that it need not fear the freedom of its members, and so democratic that it need not fear the tyranny of its leaders.

★

The most interesting point in the General International Organization is Section B of Part VIII, relative to sanctions for the maintenance of peace. Unlike the set-up under the Covenant of the League of Nations, decisions in this matter are not incumbent upon the Assembly of Nations but upon the Security Council. This simplifies the procedure, gives a greater sense of responsibility and makes possible a timely intervention, so that situations will not become aggravated. Moreover, the Council is authorized to use armed force, when this is necessary. To this end, there are foreseen a series of agreements, either regionally among the States, or between the States and the International Organization, concerning the military contribution which it is presumed may be requested in each case.

Special mention is made of the air force at the disposal of the Security Council, because with this force a rebellious State can more directly be obliged to fall back into line. Meanwhile there is proposed a Military Directive Committee which will have to give aid to the Security Council. The various resolutions of the three Sections of this Chapter, including the Section on regional arrangements, are well delineated, but of course they will undergo changes in the revision which will be made by the Assembly of the United Nations. It is to be hoped that there will be avoided both monopoly in the whole matter of military sanctions by the five powers with permanent seats and the dictatorship of the Security Council over the whole world. This shadow, which hangs over Dumbarton Oaks, causes a perplexity to arise among the other nations, feeling as they do that they are suffering a noticeable setback in their international personalities. At any rate, certain changes in this Chapter will suffice to give a happier tone of consent to the real collective responsibility of all the nations.

★

President Roosevelt in one of his election speeches said that if all wars can be prevented for an anticipated period of ten or twenty years, and the international organization is firmly adhered to (even if it is not perfect), we can be confident that we shall overcome the danger of a third general war. This is the idea which prevails today in the political world: to establish an international organization which will be able to function and at the opportune moment intervene authoritatively in the quarrels among the nations, rather than to establish an ideally perfect organization which in practice is ineffective. And it is for this reason that much will have to be conceded to the promoters of Dumbarton Oaks, given the responsibility which they had to assume. Provided, however, that the way is left open for necessary amendments to the Constitution, whenever it becomes clear that it is not functioning satisfactorily, and also provided that postwar economic reconstruction will be effected with broadness of view and generosity of impulse. One of the mistakes of the past was exactly that of enclosing the world's economy within customs barriers, anti-emigration laws, monopolistic egoisms and international cartels.

Therefore, the powers of Dumbarton Oaks thought it proper to give the new organization the task of facilitating the solution of the economic, social and humanitarian problems of the United Nations. Unfortunately, the phraseology of Chapter IX is too vague and generic; the duties of the Assembly in this matter are only indicative and consultative; there is no mention of the pledges assumed in the Atlantic Charter in economic matters, nor is mention made of the International Labor Office which still exists and is still functioning. As for the rest of the proposals, they show either lack of courage, or lack of a broad viewpoint. There is needed, therefore, a studied revision, which will yield the conviction that the economic, social and humanitarian affairs of the entire world are an integral and necessary part of the future organization for world peace.

Russia and England have been accused of pursuing power politics, with the aim of gaining spheres of influence; the United States also has been accused of pursuing a policy of economic expansion and of naval and air supremacy. The suspicion of a monopoly of the postwar era by the Big Three is a symptom not only of the national consequences of this war, but also of a fear that makes all three suspicious of each other. Therefore, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are constructed in such a manner as to give the three quite unlimited power, indeed practically a world-dictatorship; and, for that reason the power equilibrium of the Big Three is and will be unstable until it is founded on solid rock—a basis for the General International Organization which will not shake at the will of any one of them.

The famous historian and sociologist, Gu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

glielmo Ferrero, in his last books, gives evidence of the disastrous effects of fear in politics, and shows it to be the main cause of the national and international general crisis. And since Dumbarton Oaks, as it stands, cannot succeed in eliminating fear, it is not able to give security to the new world organization.

★

All say that the future of the world is linked to the complete solidarity of the Big Three, the United States, Great Britain and Russia; but solidarity does not exist if the forces of cohesion are lacking; the same fear of the future is not sufficient to bind them together *"for life and death."*

For this very reason, Senator Vandenburg has suggested a treaty among the interested powers, as a preliminary to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, with the specific aim of demilitarizing Germany and Japan, and keeping them so disarmed. It is not easy to have Russia consent to this now, because she is not at war with Japan; and besides it is not feasible that two nations like Germany and Japan be under foreign control as vanquished countries forever. Perhaps a treaty for twenty years is commendable and will be practical and useful. But, after a quarter of a century, new ideas, new feelings, new interests will change the world. The Big Three will be the big five, big six, big seven. We cannot foresee how China, India, Brazil will go; if the Arabs will become united and prepared to reacquire political influence; if Africa will be confederated; what will happen to France and her empire.

It is plainly clear that no Holy Alliance was able to maintain, in Europe, the pattern fixed by the Congress of Vienna at the beginning of the nineteenth century; so no Dumbarton Oaks or Big Three pact will prevent the change and growth of the world.

★

I grant the necessity of a pact similar to the one proposed by Senator Vandenberg, I am in favor of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, I hope that the General International Organization will be actuated very soon; I agree that *now* the main responsibility of the coming peace rests on the shoulders of the big three or four or five. But I am against any system fixed forever; I ask responsible men not to close the door to amendments to the constitution of the General International Organization, not to condemn peoples to a perpetual servitude, not to give or take permanent monopolies of political and economic world affairs by the law of victory; because after a war-victory must come a peace-victory; not chaos, not continual unrest, not a spirit of revenge, not the preparation of a third World War.

Communications

CORRECTION

Washington, D. C.

TO the Editors: May I make a rectification of something I have just discovered in a review of mine published in THE COMMONWEAL? I referred to Professor Latourette of Yale as "of the University of Pennsylvania." Why I did that is beyond me—for everyone who reads knows Professor Latourette, and admires and respects him as greatly as I do. Fortunately he is not the sort of man who would think twice of such a slip. Your editorial staff did pick it up—but in my absence could do nothing about it, supposing, I assume, that I must have some reason for it. I had none.

WILLIAM FRANKLIN SANDS.

WHAT IS THE JEWISH PROBLEM?

La Jolla, Cal.

TO the Editors: One of the 1944 presidential candidates, believe it or not, stood on a platform which told us that we have in this republican and democratic nation "a Jewish problem," a problem that, we were further told, should be earnestly considered and solved fairly and humanely.

The man who stood on this platform has been denounced as a rabble-rouser and hate-ridden demagogue. He was publicly repudiated by Governor Dewey, Republican candidate for President. But in his platform he posed as a reasonable person, who contemplated no wrong, no injustice to the ethnic group—some millions of citizens—who, according to him and his friends, present a serious problem to the country and its Gentile population.

Now let us forget, for the moment, the candidate's record on this alleged problem and try to answer him in a spirit of fairness and sweet reasonableness. Let us ask him to define and illustrate the Jewish problem. What are the facts, the sections, and the beliefs and sentiments behind the actions, which create this alleged problem?

We have a good many Jewish wage-workers, and most of them are organized and unionized. Do *they* create a problem? Are they, on the whole, bad and inefficient workers? Are they not worthy of their hire? Do their unions break the laws of the land and engage in violence? We know the answers—they are "No."

We have many Jewish educators in our colleges and schools. What problem do these men and women present? Are they subversive, seditious, immoral in their teaching? Again, the answer is "No."

We have a good many Jewish lawyers. Not a few of them are law professors and judges. Gentile firms employ leading Jewish lawyers, and not under any compulsion, it would seem. Are too many of the Jewish lawyers more tricky, more greedy, more unscrupulous than their Gentile rivals? Again, "No" is the answer.

We have Jewish doctors, and Gentiles employ them, submit to major operations by them, consult them and respect them. Do these doctors create any sort of problem? No, again.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have many Jewish merchants, brokers and traders. Are their ways and habits as a group morally inferior to those of their Gentile colleagues? Do they furnish more inmates of our prisons and penitentiaries? No, once more.

We have Jewish editors, journalists, authors, poets and critics? What problem do they present?

We have Jewish farmers—alas, not as many as we could wish. Here, in truth, *is* a problem. Under our laws Jews have the right and the opportunity to return to the cultivation of the soil, and it is a pity more of them are not doing so. In Palestine, the Jewish farmers are giving a splendid account of themselves. They would anywhere, because they apply modern methods and are progressive socially and otherwise. Is *this* the problem our candidate had in mind? Let him say so, and we assure him that he will have many supporters. The late Jane Addams, of Hull House, repeatedly expressed the opinion that about one-sixth of the Jewish population should till the soil, as that would dispose of the charge of "parasitism" often leveled at it. Miss Addams was right. But it is not at all likely that our anti-Semitic candidate is thinking of this aspect of the issue he raises. What, then, is he thinking of?

In recent years, *Fortune* and other magazines of national circulation and influence have investigated the charge that Jews control banking, finance, the theater, the opera and concert business and the movies. The results were not adverse to the Jews as a group.

Other charges investigated and disproved—such as that too many Jews are revolutionary Communists—need not be taken up here. They are too absurd on their face, and are not proffered in good faith or by persons who value truth.

Let me close with a definite suggestion. Let the anti-Semitic candidate prepare and mail a circular letter to a hundred distinguished Americans, leaders in science, philosophy, religion, the liberal professions, industry and trade, and in that document put the question to them, "Is there a Jewish problem in America, and, if so, what is the nature of that problem?" The answers may prove illuminating and sobering. They certainly will be of deep interest to all intelligent and loyal Americans.

VICTOR S. YARROS.

PRESENT DISCONTENTS

St. John's, Newfoundland.

TO the Editors: I wish to thank you for your recent editorials and articles, "Present Discontents," and to congratulate you on their wisdom and judiciousness. I read your number of January 5 a few hours after hearing over the BBC Mr. Brendan Bracken's explanation to General Eisenhower about that wretched made-in-Germany newscast, and his assurances of British regard. I don't know whether it was more humiliating for Bracken to have to make such an explanation or for Eisenhower to receive it.

I am one who has the temerity to believe that not until the United States and Britain embody mutual obligations in some common institutions will the relations between them provide a foundation for peace. Developments since the Dumbarton Oaks Conference have shown how frail a basis is offered by the mere continued friendly cooperation postulated in that illusory declaration. Mutual trust is so conspicuously lacking that every thoughtless accusation made or acquiesced-in, every jibe and reproach is a stab at the peace we protest so deeply about. The reality of the danger is reflected alike in the bitterness of Mr. Churchill's references to "poor old England" and in private correspondence from the Old Country. "Mass Observation" records that Americans figure lowest but one in the order of popularity of foreign soldiers in England, a sufficiently unpromising fact.

When the atmosphere is thus bitterly charged you are rendering a signal service to the common cause by maintaining so high a level of discussion.

ALFRED C. HUNTER.

M. GILSON

2 Avenue Emile-Acollas, Paris VII,
January 11, 1945.

DEAR Mr. Sheed: Your friendly letter of November 26 reached me this very morning. Please tell all my American friends, personally known or unknown, that I am in good health, still at work, and teaching or writing as usual. . . . The real trouble is, I cannot write unless I smoke, and there is very little to smoke on this side of the water. How could one write on an empty pipe? I am going to think about it. What would not I give to see your 63 Fifth Avenue again! The more so as, unless my memory plays me false, there is a cafeteria nearby. . . . Does such a thing as a cup of coffee still really exist? Thank you again. It did me good to receive a letter from England, the first I have received since Liberation Day.

ET. GILSON.

The Stage & Screen

Hope For The Best

WILLIAM McCLEERY'S play goes something like this: a Connecticut columnist who has amassed eleven million readers by writing of the joys of life in Indiana suddenly decides that he must reel off politics for the benefit of the average man. Two beautiful girls, one a sympathetic defense-worker, the second a sophisticated political columnist herself, line up at appropriate angles to the man and his problem and go after both. You will guess the conclusion. It is, without question a well-meaning affair, but as I have never believed in the Average Man, naturally the prospect of someone having counted eleven million of him fills me with despair and I must say the point of the conflict passed me by. Franchot Tone is customarily sincere as the hero, Joan Wetmore customarily nasty as the lady expert, and Jane Wyatt comes off certainly as an extremely attractive ingenue, although here she did not (understandably) seem very easy in her lines. One interesting thing is that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

audience's roaring sympathy with Mr. Tone's frustrated actions at the typewriter amply confirms every writer's suspicion that everyone in the world is a writer. Although why! why! why! still remains the mystery of the times. (*At the Fulton.*)

One Man Show

A GIRL'S unnatural relationship with her father is the theme of Ruth Goodman's and Augustus Goetz's play, and if a good bit of its development seems tortuous, it does have, I think, dramatic fascination. Set in a small New York Art Gallery, run by the father and daughter, the piece presents three further characters, men —one a painter, one a financier, one a breezy young extrovert working for the government—all with an emotional interest in the heroine and a wish (second thought on the part of the moneyman) to marry her. The machinations of her father to prevent this normal occurrence and his ultimate defeat (plus the girl's ignorant reluctance to face life without him), comprise the action. Where the piece tangles is that, neatly constructed as it is, it is written as tight as a murder mystery. Throughout the entire thing there are spoken clues which must be irrevocably grasped and remembered by the house for an understanding of the ensuing happenings, and this process has the double effect of presenting a group of believable, interesting characters who, for some reason or other, seem to place puzzling emphasis on certain of their opening remarks and who later, therefore, seem to be progressing through a series of coincidences rather than through scenes representative of life. It's a complicated technical problem. Perhaps the nature of their theme (as horrifying to most people possibly as murder) prevented the authors from a more simple approach. A second fallacy in the writing occurs when the authors allow the young man (final savior of the girl) to display the most acute knowledge of female psychology in the second act, only to be most hazardously bluffed by the obvious hypocrisy of her father in the third. This would seem to imply that men are able to understand women better than they do other men, a proposition which I (and I am sure any man) must consider far-fetched. In any case, here it presented a good many impatient delaying moments to the audience. But these errors do not, I feel, prevent the piece from emerging as an adult, subtle, sensitive document, finely played. Constance Cummings in the chief role is expert: precisely as attractive, various, and moving as the part demands, and I may say, considering the territories it covers, the part is as long as it is profound. Frank Conroy's Father, John Archer's Suitor are exact, and I particularly liked Hugh Franklin's interpretation of the young Painter, emphasizing the comparative naivete and abstraction of the creative man. Jed Harris's direction is noticeably discerning. Not the least of the dramatic interest must depend upon the author's choice of and Stewart Chaney's execution of the scene. (*At the Ethel Barrymore.*)

An Open Letter To Noah Beery

Dear Mr. Beery: In writing you down as *Noah Webster* in my last week's review of "Up in Central Park," I guess I should tell you that that was not the printer, it was me. **Oh Boy.**

Sincerely yours,
KAPPO PHELAN.

Further Studies in Grue

HOLLYWOOD'S current cycle of murder films and mysteries is reaching its zenith. This type of cinema has always been popular with movie makers, but never before have murder themes inspired so many A productions with outstanding directors, writers and stars. Last year, "The Lodger," "Double Indemnity," "Gaslight," "Laura," "The Woman in the Window," "Dark Waters" gave goose pimples to film fans and serious students, and continue to do so wherever these pictures are still playing. Now four new arrivals, all A productions with good casts, are going the rounds to chill spines and provide escape. Select your chiller below.

Although *"Ministry of Fear"* has failed to catch the subtlety and implications of Graham Greene's novel, it is still a thrilling movie—particularly in the first half where Director Fritz Lang employs Greene's method of suspense to good advantage. All the things we suspect but don't quite know during this part of the film keep us on edge; and clue upon clue, all in shadowy suspicion, add up until nerves are tense with expectancy. At the film's beginning, the hero is released from an asylum after a two year's sentence for a mercy-killing. He is warned not to get involved with the police in any way; so when he wins a cake at a garden fête—a cake that a gang of suspicious-looking characters obviously want—he takes it upon himself to find out what is what. The cake and the organization known as Mothers of Free Nations are not as innocent as they seem and soon make our hero the hunted as well as the hunter. A brother and sister with German accents, and a series of characters picked up at a séance, a book store and a tailoring establishment, all get involved in events that finally lead to the Ministry of Home Security. But after Director Lang has managed to get us all worked up and ready for an exciting conclusion, the film dissolves into a conventional chase thriller and we are given a solution that might have been tacked onto any B spy-and-chase melodrama. The cast (led by Ray Milland, Carl Esmond, Marjorie Reynolds, Dan Duryea) is well directed by Lang who uses the gloom of London's dimouts for all the shadows and terrors they hold. Unfortunately the script by Seton I. Miller (who also produced the film) fails to stand up even under Lang's good direction. The script also muffed Graham Greene's handling of the mercy-killing situation; whereas Greene left no doubt in the reader's mind about the immorality of killing your wife regardless of how much pain she might be going through, the film is vague on the subject and dismisses it with uncertainty.

The main character in *"The Suspect"* goes in for wife killing, too. But mercy is not his motive. He is moved by hate and anger and desire to get someone out of the way who is very much in the way. He later feels that he has to kill another person, this time a blackmailer who has guessed his secret too well. In fact by the time the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

second murder occurs, one suspects "The Suspect" of trying to say that murder is the best way to get rid of vicious people who clutter up your life. The finale of course denies this; and the picture comes to a very proper crime-does-not-pay conclusion. But there are moments when one wonders just where Bertram Millhauser's script (based on a novel by James Ronald) is leading. Especially since the central figure, a manager of a tobacco shop, is portrayed by Charles Laughton in an excellent performance as a kindly, patient man; and his victims (Rosalind Ivan as his mean, nagging wife and Henry Daniell as the alcoholic blackmailer) are played with venomous intensity as the personification of evil. All this takes place in London in 1902. Islin Auster has provided this period piece with an excellent production: sets, costumes, photography are in keeping with the whole. And Robert Siodmak has directed with a deliberate slow build-up that heightens the suspense through underplaying and warning of things to come. I was not entirely convinced of the motivations throughout the film. It is difficult to understand how the girl in the case, although effectively played with forlorn loneliness by Ella Raines, could have fallen for such a middle-class, middle-age gent. It is also difficult to understand where this man checked his conscience and middle-class morality during and after his two murders. However, through tense handling of the story, Director Siodmak keeps your eyes glued to the screen. Two of the scenes might even give you nightmares: the macabre funeral of the murdered wife, and the later reenactment of the murder by the smart Scotland Yard man before the terrified eyes of the murderer.

"Hangover Square" is not a mystery picture at all; it is a murder and horror affair; and the mystery, if any, is what became of Patrick Hamilton's modern psychopathic novel on which it was supposedly based. In reviewing the film, it might be well to forget the Hamilton book (just as the film makers did) and consider the movie for what it is: a case history of a schizophrenic. Barre Lyndon's script tells the story of George Bone, a pianist-composer in London at the turn of the century. When rational, George (Laird Cregar) is a very likeable fellow, kind to animals, in love with the girl (Faye Marlowe) across the square, and a composer of good music. But a discordant sound is liable to set him berserk, and in periods of forgetfulness he does awful things—with murder as his specialty. This Jekyll-Hyde creation has little of the moral implication of the Stevenson novel. George's story provides an interesting study in abnormal psychology and attempts little more. Robert Bassler has given the film a good production; and John Brahm has directed his cast (which includes George Sanders as a Scotland Yard doctor and Linda Darnell as a coarse music-hall singer) exceedingly well with an emphasis on the horror of the situation when George's baser self is on the loose. The film's music and photography assist admirably to accentuate the moods and themes. "Hangover Square" won't exactly frighten the wits out of you (except perhaps during the Guy Fawkes revelries) but it is bound to hold you fascinated with its unusual subject matter.

The hardest and toughest of all these new murder mysteries is called *"Murder, My Sweet!"* This lovely little item belongs to the "Double Indemnity" school and has a batch of characters that one wouldn't even say hello to in real life. But they're very amusing in a repulsive sort of way in this fast moving film. John Paxton based his script on "Farewell My Lovely," a novel by Raymond Chandler. The film originally had the same title, but due to some kind of Hollywood flim-flam it was changed. Either title fits well the unpleasant but absorbing story, the brutal action and the terrifying suspense. Director Edward Dmytryk employs cinema tricks to good effect, especially in the scenes in which the detective-hero is knocked out by drugs or the villains' handy fists. Dmytryk, with full understanding of the vicious undercurrents in Chandler's story, has succeeded in getting subtle performances out of his cast: Dick Powell, Claire Trevor, Miles Mander, Anne Shirley, Mike Mazurki. But there are times when the literary qualities of the script detract from the picture's credibility. I don't believe I could have stood one more crack from the hero Mike: "A black pool opened up at my feet and I dived in!"

PHILIP T. HARTUNG.

Books of the Week

A Preface to Newman's Theology. Edmond Darvil Benard. Herder. $2.25.

OPINIONS about Cardinal Newman varied strikingly during his lifetime, and have varied since. If I may quote with propriety from a rather flippant Roman Catholic writer, Shane Leslie, cited by Father Benard in his valuable bibliography for the present work: "Perhaps he was indeed a Victorian prophet and saint, relegated humble and forgotten at Littlemore as on Mount Athos, dwelling oracular at Birmingham as on Mount Sinai. Perhaps, on the other hand, he was an ecclesiastical Mrs. Gummidge, a poor forlorn creature complaining to all and sundry (in exquisite prose) that everything went contrary with him, and he with everybody."

The popular conception of Newman differs profoundly, however, from either extreme estimate. He was the bright particular star of Victorian Oxford, a shining theologic influence, not only over his own country and generation, but over other lands and generations to come, the begetter of a great and constantly advancing movement which has all but succeeded in re-Catholicizing the English Church on two continents and over the seven seas of Kipling's Empire. High Churchmen inscribe his name upon their banners; so do modernists, if there are any left; and Father Benard has written his admirable book partly in order to capture Newman's name from among the modernist flags. Newman is, in fact, a kind of canonized saint; and not so long ago, an American Catholic review backed him for formal canonization.

And yet the Newman found in text-books and in many popular biographies does not altogether satisfy one's sense of realities. The common treatment of him today is a good sample of that process of unofficial beatification so often found among the sentimental Anglo-Saxons. Edith Cavell, Florence Nightingale, Abraham Lincoln are other cases in point. It is the verbal equivalent to the art of stained glass. The real Newman was a being so much more vital, more passionately interesting than his luminous

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effigy, that any student of the Cardinal, still more one who venerates him, may well be pardoned for still thinking of him as a human being rather than a funereal monument, or the hero of a nun's novelette.

One thing about Newman seems to be fairly certain; he could be dangerous. We call the austere masculine ghost of Cardinal Manning to witness. And that of the vigorous, and often charming writer, Charles Kingsley! In view of the fact that Kingsley's nonchalant attack upon the Catholic priesthood in 1863 gave Newman the greatest opportunity of his career—the writing of the "Apologia"—it is strange to feel, in old editions of the letter, the personal malignity with which the future Cardinal turned and rent his badly matched antagonist. A superb polemical journalist was lost when Newman devoted himself to theology. A great deal of rather gushing sympathy has been expended on him, not alone by Catholics, or even by himself, since 1863; while Kingsley has had the usual fate of the well-intentioned, meted out for destruction at the hands of an unrivaled master of cruel dialectic. Kingsley honestly and candidly hated the Roman Church as something infinitely old, polished, tortuous and sophisticated; and he hated what Father Benard has called Newman's theological method for several of the same reasons. So did Cardinal Manning hate it, though not, of course, from the same motives. It has been stated that the "Apologia" had a large part in gaining Newman the Scarlet Hat; hence there is an extraordinary candor in his words on hearing of Kingsley's death: "How could I feel any resentment against him who was the instrument in the good Providence of God by whom *I had an opportunity given me which otherwise I should not have had?*"

In fact, he is so complex and fascinating a figure that we have been led into devoting more time to him than to a notice of Father Benard's excellent book, invaluable to one more interested in Newman's theology than his temperament. Father Benard knows perfectly well, however, that an understanding of the latter is requisite for an understanding of the former; and the fifth chapter of his second section has that very title and subject. His main object is, as we have hinted, to rescue Newman from the theological privateering and freebooting of modernists like Loisy and the late Father Tyrell. In his introduction, the author reminds us very cogently that "heretics have done the same thing to the Fathers of the Church, the Epistles of Saint Paul, and the Holy Gospels." Even John Knox, it seems, did not always disdain "that serviceable Papist," Saint Thomas Aquinas.

Although his formal verses do not amount to a great deal, Newman was essentially a poet, a child of the romantic revival of Wordsworth and Coleridge, and there is much poetry, in the finest sense of the word, even in his theology. Passages like the following do not seem to me to have much to do with religion or Christianity, as I understand the terms, but they are undoubtedly touched by that frenzy which some people think is an essential ingredient of the poetic temper: "The Catholic Church holds it better for the sun and moon to drop from heaven, for the earth to fail, and for all the many millions on it to die of starvation in extremest agony, as far as temporal affliction goes, than that one soul, I will not say, should be lost, but commit one single venial sin, should tell one wilful untruth, or should steal one poor farthing without excuse."

Newman, with his customary subtlety, rescues the passage from nonsense, at the last possible moment, by suffix-

STRANGERS SHOULD NOT WHISPER

by Jan-Albert Goris

Belgian Commissioner of Information

A courageous European finds life worth living and tells you why!

THE COMMONWEAL says: ***"It is very wonderful to read Mr. Goris . . . a book filled with vitality and hope."***

L. B. FISCHER PUBLISHING CORP.
381 Fourth Ave., New York 16

Please send me ..... copies of STRANGERS SHOULD NOT WHISPER @ $2.75 per copy.

Name .....

Address .....

City, Zone, State .....

Advertising

Lenten Reading

THE GOSPEL FOR THE LAITY. By Rev. F. J. Remler, C.M. A splendid opportunity for Catholics who do not realize the beauty and value of religious knowledge to learn what the Gospels have to say and how the Gospel narrative is used to show the fundamental truths of religion. (B. Herder, St. Louis) ----------$2.00

THE HELIOTROPIUM. By Jeremias Drexelius. After 314 years this classic on the conforming of the human will to the Divine still makes the best—most satisfactory—war time Lenten reading. There is no better book for anyone (of any creed or no creed) who has felt the impact of the present war—none more appropriate for the bereaved. 400 pp. (Devin-Adair Co., 23 E. 26 St., N. Y. C. 10)-$2.50

DRINK FROM THE ROCK. Selected poems from *Spirit*. Introduction by Helen C. White. Edited by John Gilland Brunini. "A distinguished collection . . . the high level of general excellence serves as no foil to any special jewels."—The Commonweal. (Order from Book Service Dept., The Commonweal, 386 4th Ave., N. Y. C. 16)----------$2.00

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Last Call for Catholic Press Month

NEXT WEEK'S ISSUE, the first March '45 issue of The Commonweal, will feature an article which is exceedingly useful in the light of the Big Three statement just announced from the Crimea. It is a "London Commentary" by J. L. Benvenisti which has just reached here from overseas. It deals really with three vital matters. The first is that of the advisability of an Anglo-Russian alliance as opposed to the Lippmann idea of a separate "Atlantic Community" and a "Russian Orbit." Mr. Benvenisti cites Greek difficulties to prove his point. His article also discusses socialized medicine and how much the success of a democracy depends upon the right approach in our schools.

As we wrote in these columns last week it becomes increasingly difficult in these days of lightning historic change to schedule complete issues of the magazine very far ahead, but we are reasonably certain that the Benvenisti article will appear in these pages next week.

This is the last week for another year in which the special Catholic Press Month offer of sixteen issues for $1 applies. And the epoch-making weeks which lie ahead provide an unparalleled opportunity for accepting this generous get-acquainted trial subscription offer.

In Catholic Press Month Only:

16 Weeks for $1

FOR NEW SUBSCRIBERS

THE COMMONWEAL,
386 Fourth Ave.,
New York 16, N. Y.

For the enclosed $1 send me the next 16 issues of THE COMMONWEAL

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

2/23/45

ing the last two words. In reading such fragments, however, one begins to discern dimly the reason for Kingsley's attack.

CUTHBERT WRIGHT.

The Shape of Books to Come. J. Donald Adams. Viking. $2.50.

"NATURALISM in the American novel has, I believe, spent itself." . . . "The day of man's degradation is dead." . . . "There is breaking over literature, I believe, the first light of a new dawn of hope and will," and . . . "literature, during the years immediately ahead, will seek above all else to restore the dignity of the human spirit." . . . "Writers have contributed as much, if not more, than any other group to the mood of negation and despair which has gripped our world. They can play as large a part in its reorientation and its constructive effort, and I believe they not only can but will, for they have already begun."

In these few sentences, casually chosen, you see the tone and quality of Mr. Adams's book; and you see, of course, his thesis. I call it a stirring book, an exciting book, and—for anyone who professes interest in the American novel of today and tomorrow—an important book.

Let's not argue the thesis. Mr. Adams was for eighteen years the editor of the New York *Times* Book Review, and no one is any better qualified to judge the rise and fall of the literary tides, and to say, quietly and forthrightly, that the American novel and American poetry are at long last through the adolescent stage—the period of disillusionment, futility and despair; of man's disgust with man—and that we are already launched upon a period marked by an affirmative attitude toward life, a certain eagerness and zest for life, a sense of expectancy and hope, and a realization that while life is not angelic, neither is it an evil and a meaningless joke.

Let's not argue the thesis here. But, for my part, I can't help rejoice over the wealth of evidence which Mr. Adams brings forward in support of it.

DAVID MARSHALL.

Great Son. Edna Ferber. Doubleday. $2.50.

SEATTLE and Alaska are the scene of this latest Edna Ferber; they are also by far the most important elements in this not clearly explicable book club choice. The characters themselves are shadowy and this family saga all seems mighty hazy and far away. Notable only for a few flashes of local color of a pioneer sort.

CONTRIBUTORS

The ARMY PRIVATE who sends us the interesting parallel between Prussian and American thinking on peacetime military training must, under Army regulations, remain anonymous.

J. M. O'NEILL is the head of the Department of Speech at Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Don Luigi STURZO, one of the founders of the pre-fascist Christian democratic party in Italy, has just published "Inner Laws of Society—a New Sociology." Perhaps his best known previous book was "Church and State."

Cuthbert WRIGHT teaches at Assumption College, Worcester, Mass.

David MARSHALL is the author of a standard book on model railroads as well as of a life of Parnell. He is a New York newspaper man.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED